

Appl. No. : **09/277,335**
Filed : **March 26, 1999**

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) and 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-6, 13, 14, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,032,257, to Olarig, et al. (hereinafter “Olarig”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,513,262, to van Rumpt, et al. (hereinafter “van Rumpt1”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,231,662 (hereinafter “van Rumpt2”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,563,950, to Easter, et al (hereinafter “Easter”). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olarig, van Rumpt1, Easter, and U.S. Patent No. 5,343,525, to Hung. Claims 7-10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olarig, van Rumpt1, and U.S. Patent No. 5,818,939, to Davis (hereinafter “Davis”). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olarig, van Rumpt1, van Rumpt2, and Davis.

One embodiment of Applicant’s invention is directed to a system and method that allows for the secure storage of data that is used and created by an individual when using their computer. In one embodiment, encryption hardware may be provided that receives data from a processor in the computer and encrypts the data prior to storing the data on the computer and decrypts the data when it is retrieved from storage. A cryptographic key may be generated that is derived at least in part from received user input and information that is stored in a non-erasable memory in said computer system during manufacture of said computer system. After being generated, the cryptographic keys is compared against a checksum that is stored in a configuration register in the system. In one embodiment, the configuration register is in a bus-to-bus bridge. If the checksum is not verified, the encryption process is halted. There are several reasons why key generation might fail. An error in reading the hardware identification may cause faulty key generation. Tampering may also result in incorrect key generation.

Appl. No. : **09/277,335**
Filed : **March 26, 1999**

Claims 1, 5, 7, and 15

Applicant respectfully submits that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *See M.P.E.P. § 2131*. Furthermore, to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03*. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited prior fails to teach or suggest at least one limitation from each of the above-listed claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited art describes a configuration register, as claimed, in a bus-to-bus bridge. In the Examiner Interview, the Examiner agreed that none of the cited art described at least this limitation. Furthermore, it was discussed that claims related application, U.S. Application No. 09/277,482, having claims directed to encryption circuitry in a bus-to-bus bridge, was recently allowed. Since the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest at least the above-limitations, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-14, and 16-18

Since Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-14, and 16-18 each depend on one of independent Claims 1, 5, 7, and 15 Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable for the reasons discussed above and the subject matter of their own limitations.

Conclusion

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims for patentability purposes, the reasons therefore, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are not made for patentability purposes, and the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. In addition, such amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. Rather, these amendments have only been made to increase claim readability, to improve grammar, and to reduce the time and effort required of those in the art to clearly understand the scope of the claim language. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is

Appl. No. : 09/277,335
Filed : March 26, 1999

specifically requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: July 19, 2005

By: EDN
Eric M. Nelson
Registration No. 43,829
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

[1818474
071805]

1820966:sad
071905